

REMARKS

Claims 90-95, 97-102 and 105-108 are currently pending, of which claims 90, 99 and 105 are in independent form. Claims 90, 99 and 105 are amended by the present response.

No new matter is added hereby.

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Provisional Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 90, 99 and 105 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over (i) claims 65, 97 and 108 of copending application No. 09/782,412 and (ii) claims 71, 84 and 95 of copending Application No. 10/671,162.

Without acquiescing in the characterization of the claims of the present patent application or of the allegedly conflicting claims of Application Nos. 09/782,412 or 10/671,162 as set forth in the outstanding Office Action in connection with the pending double patenting rejections, Applicant has enclosed herewith appropriate terminal disclaimers in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the

pending double patenting rejection has been obviated hereby. Also attached herewith is a Power of Attorney instrument executed by the Assignee of Record that appoints the undersigned to prosecute the present application. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the pending double patenting rejection has been obviated hereby.

Regarding the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 90-95, 97-102 and 105-108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc: Mail, Communication Server Guide, Motorola, 1995 in view of AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc: Mail, Communication Client Guide, Motorola, 1995 (collectively hereinafter the *AirMobile* reference) and in further view of Carthy et al. (MAPI Developers Forum post "MAPI Notification" April 12, 1996; hereinafter the *Carthy* reference), U.S. Patent No. 5,764,899 to Eggleston et al. (hereinafter the *Eggleston* reference), U.S. Patent No. 6,289,105 to Murota (hereinafter the *Murota* reference), U.S. Patent No. 6,381,634 to Tello et al. (hereinafter the *Tello* reference) and U.S. Patent No. 5,826,023 (hereinafter the *Hall* reference).

Without acquiescing in the characterization of the rejected claims and/or of the cited art provided in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing §103(a) rejections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot by way of the present response. Pending base claim 90 is directed to an embodiment of a method of redirecting information between a messaging host system and a wireless mobile data device that is associated with a computer connected over a network to the messaging host system. As currently amended, the claimed method comprises, *inter alia*, receiving an indication at a redirector component indicating receipt of a mail item by the messaging host system for a user from a sender, wherein the mail item is addressed to a first address identifying a mailbox that is viewable by the user via the user's computer coupled to the host system. Substantially identical features are also recited in base claim 99 as currently constituted.

In reply to Applicant's prior response dated February 12, 2009, the Examiner commented as follows at page 4 of the Office Action:

With regard to claim 90, and Applicant's assertion that Tello "does not teach or suggest a first address of the user that is associated with the

messaging host system" (Remarks 15-17), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As an initial matter, it is noted that the language "associated with" is very broad and requires a minimal relationship between the host system and the first address to be anticipated. The well-known name address taught by Tello is associated with the ISP's mail server, which is analogous to the communication server in AirMobile, which also processes electronic messages for the user. When considered in combination, AirMobile and Tello teach a first and second address associated with the user, wherein the first address is associated with a host device such as an email server and the second address is associated with a mobile device.

Without necessarily acquiescing in the Examiner's remarks relating to the interpretation of the phrase "associated with", Applicant has amended the language to sufficiently distinguish between the features of the claimed embodiments and the *Tello* reference. In view of the present amendments, Applicant continues to take the position that *Tello* does not teach or suggest a first address identifying a mailbox that is viewable at a user's computer. As argued in the prior response of February 12, 2009, the *Tello* reference is merely concerned with email address portability, i.e., the need for email addresses that can be retained by users even when they change their Internet Service Provider (ISP). Even if, *arguendo*, "name@@well.known" of *Tello* were an email address, which

Applicant does not agree with, it is not an address that identifies a mailbox containing the user data items viewable at the ISP's mail server. As explained previously, the well-known-name value (i.e., "name@@wellknown") is designed such that the "@@" characters operate as a trigger to alert a sender's ISP, i.e., ISP 100 in *Tello*, that an external "translation service" (e.g., SCP 200) must be accessed before an email message may be transmitted to the intended recipient. Thus it is clear that "name@@wellknown" of *Tello* is not an email address that is viewable by the user.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully maintains that the present amendments distinguish over the teachings of *Tello*, which has been relied upon to cure the acknowledged deficiencies of the primary reference of record, i.e., *AirMobile*. Applicant further submits that the various secondary references (i.e., *Carthy*, *Eggleston*, *Murota*, *Hall* or Official Notice) applied in the pending Office Action to overcome the cumulative deficiencies of *Eggleston* and *Tello* are without avail with respect to the present amendments.

It is therefore believed that pending base claims 90, 99 and 105 as currently constituted are in condition for allowance

over the art of record. Respective dependent claims are also allowable over the art at least for the same reasons.

Reservation of Rights

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as, e.g., the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of the present claims, the right to challenge any Official Notice(s) taken, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections of the present Office Action, or the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 or otherwise.

Fee Statement

Compared to the highest number previously paid for, the total number of claims and the number of independent claims have not increased. A petition for a THREE-month extension of the response period is being sought. Applicant is also filing herewith two Terminal Disclaimers. Accordingly, payment via electronic filing is being authorized in the applicable amount(s). If any additional fees are due or any overpayments have been made, however, please charge or credit our deposit account (Deposit Account No. 03-1130).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of the record, whether considered alone or in combination discloses, anticipates or suggests the present embodiments, as now defined by the independent claims, and in further view of the above amendments and/or remarks, reconsideration of the Action and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 14, 2009

/Shreen K. Danamraj/
Shreen K. Danamraj
Registration No. 41,696

THE DANAMRAJ LAW GROUP, P.C.
Premier Place, Suite 1450
5910 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel (214) 750-5666
Fax (214) 363-8177